

## **Energy Futures Task Force – Minutes – prepared by Amanda Siano, Minute Recorder**

**Meeting Date: August 25, 2016 - Minutes Approved September 8, 2016**

**Attendees:** Pam Hill, Chair, Elise Woodward, John Dalton, Brian Foulds, Wally Johnston

**Citizens:** Fran Cummings, Brendan , Laura Scott, CMLP

**Preliminary matter:** Welcome to Amanda Siano who will be providing note taking support and perhaps additional support at a later date.

- 1. Approval of minutes:** Elise Woodward provided two sets of minutes for approval. One from July 14<sup>th</sup> and one from August 11<sup>th</sup>. One typo noted in July 14 minutes, no committee comments. Motion to unanimously approve was accepted. One typo noted in August 11 minutes, no committee comments. Motion to approve, with one abstain, was accepted. With regard to logistics, Elise will mark minutes approved and send to Pam Hill and Andrew Mara.
- 2. Correspondence:** Pam Hill has received two items from Dan Gainsboro: 1) a survey report from CMLP for both the committee and the public; 2) a letter drafted by an attorney on behalf of CMLP regarding the sale of SREC'S by Green Mountain Power. John Dalton was concerned with how widely the information should it be disseminated without approval from CMLP or the author. Pam will speak with Dan to determine if the item is a document to be shared publicly. EFTF members confirmed they have been receiving correspondence from the electronic mailbox. Pam's remaining task with respect to the website email box is to ensure the packet materials are available. A packet is defined as all materials that would be the subject of committee meetings, for example minutes, agenda, etc. Correspondence will not be included in the packet until the information has been vetted and discussed by the EFTF. Brian Foulds noted he had not received correspondence from June to current. Elise now has access to the email box and will send any correspondence to EFTF committee members. Elise will also sort incoming correspondence to allow for a more manageable subset of topics to discuss. Brian Foulds wished to discuss a Renewable Communities article he had submitted. It was agreed to discuss the document in question later in the meeting under the category of Best Practices.
- 3. Chair's report:** Pam will have further discussions with Alice and Mike regarding use of limited resources available to the committee. There is a small amount of money for use for skilled individuals who are available to EFTF. One is Amanda Siano; another is Brendan who is working as a volunteer intern until he leaves.
- 4. Resources: administrative support, volunteers, interns:** Amanda Siano is available to take minutes for upcoming meetings. Amanda could be a resource for additional word processing functions such as taking minutes/notes for interviews as well as compilation of the final report. The committee has agreed that if Pam could secure a monetary payment for Brendan, EFTF is in favor of paying him. Pam confirmed financial resources are \$5,000. This leads to the question of how to apportion the funds. A volunteer could be offered a stipend that would be a lump sum as opposed to an hourly rate.
- 5. Task force working group work plan updates**

**-Energy and emissions (Brian Foulds)**

Work plan is up to date and dates are identified for compiling drafts.

**-Other cities and towns/best practices (Elise Woodward)**

A revised work plan was submitted for posting to the website. Municipal contacts were added. Interviews have begun. Carlisle has been interviewed. Correspondence with Lincoln and Lexington prior to interviews with them. Brian Foulds discussed the Renewable Communities report by Environment Massachusetts mentioned earlier in the meeting. The report reads much like what the EFTF is trying to establish. For example, what are other communities doing, what are some ideas, how have they structured it. Brian Foulds suggested committee members at least skim or read through the report and pull out pertinent information. The report provides a sense of where other towns in Massachusetts are in their efforts to do renewable tasks and create communities that better manage energy and emissions. Elise suggested this report will be especially useful during the decision making to decide together whether all the elements of the report are applicable to Concord or whether to focus only on certain aspects of the report. Elise also noted that when correspondence is distributed to EFTF there have been many suggestions of similarly strong reports that other communities have done.

**-Government documents (Pam Hill)**

Pam turned the discussion lead over to Brendan to: 1. update on what he has done thus far; 2. present the structure being used to capture the material; 3. seek comments from EFTF on types of documents to be reviewed. A template has been created which may be used for any town documents from Concord's Important Documents section on the website, as well as different committee's and commission's documents. This template organizes the information in a visually easy to understand way and provides a section for a short description of the document and a section for a brief summary of how this information effects EFTF and its goals. The following website pages have been reviewed: town bylaws, Historic Districts Commission, zoning bylaws and a few others. When reviewing CMLP documents, Brendan will work with Dan, John and Laura who is the liaison. Brian suggested another area to include is the assessor's office. Additionally, Elise suggested research of building code at the building inspector's office, Concord Sustainable Energy Committee, Green Communities Act (information that was collected to support Concord's effort to become a Green Community), Energy Stretch Code, Administrative Planning Policies and the Clean Energy Plan. The methodology used to create the template included going through the town's website and identifying the important documents section and skimming through to find relevant information. Relevant is defined as documents that might create barriers to work EFTF might want to do, or documents that may govern recommendations EFTF may have. URL links in the form of pdfs are desired. This template serves as an excellent resource and may be an Appendix to the report. Notation of cross-referencing opportunities would be beneficial. Suggested ideas for inclusion or priority in the template should be emailed to Pam. State and Federal regulations that impact choices in Concord will be covered during interviews. Brendan will also create a template to capture state and federal documents.

**-CMLP (John Dalton and Dan Gainsboro)**

John Dalton reviewed and discussed the PowerPoint document, titled: "CMLP's Role in Delivering Energy Efficiency and its Importance in GHG Emission Reduction". This document is posted to the town's website and marked as a draft. Four issues were identified for CMLP: 1. energy efficiency, 2. rate related issues, 3. Chapter 164, 4. renewables, retirement of RECS,

renewable procurement targets. Recommendations may be given to CMLP by the EFTF for consideration by CMLP's strategic consultant. From John's perspective EFTF cannot go deep enough in terms of this presentation to make any recommendations. The intent is that the PowerPoint contains enough information to advance the task force's thinking. Brian Foulds commented on the issue of CMLP decoupling. He further explained, CMLP has to sell a certain volume of kilowatt hours to be able to support operations at the light plant. The 2008 Green Communities Act required the investor owned utilities to decouple. Utilities were required to find a mechanism to separate fixed cost recovery from sales volume but Municipals were exempt. But that doesn't preclude Municipals from doing the same thing if it's in their own interest. CMLP conservation efforts are largely cost dependent. Those that only reduce kilowatt hour sales are not of value to CMLP. Efforts that avoid peaks are of value to CMLP. Thus much of their enacted rebates focus on peaks or the generation cost in winter. This presentation does not get into rate issues. Rates are a separate set of issues. Brian wants to point out that choices made for conservation efforts that are enacted vs. those that aren't have a bearing on whether or not the rate is coupled or decoupled. John says it depends on how you are evaluating the matters and what test is being used to evaluate. EFTF is not prepared to debate it. Operation of investor owned utilities is different than municipal light plants in some respects. The deregulation requirements for investor owned utilities are different than those for municipal utilities. Benefits in regulations for investor owned utilities may be applied to municipal utilities. EFTF should have an attitude as to whether we would consider recommending these to CMLP. Another point is that electric utilities have played a role in delivering energy efficiency programs from the 1980's. In particular, another issue is that energy efficiency is often considered a least cost supply source. And inherent in design of energy efficiency programs is an objective to make sure that you are pursuing programs and measures that are cost effective. Essentially that cost less than the benefits that they provide. That ensures it's going to be a least cost resource. For 2016 the average cost of their programs was about \$0.406/per kilowatt hour which is well below any estimate in terms of what are the cost of existing generation when you look at the cost of capital and the cost of fuel.

For our purposes this is a key issue in that the degree you reduce energy consumption CO2 emissions will be reduced. Fossil fuels where these emissions are generated are often referred to as the marginal resource. They are the highest cost resource that's operated on the system. To the degree that you reduce consumption emissions from these units will be reduced. Output of renewable resources will not be reduced, output of natural gas for resources will be reduced. Energy efficiency is going to produce meaningful carbon productions. One study referenced by the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, a credible advocacy organization, suggests that the clean power plan of EPA's in excess of 25% of the emissions reductions mandated from that could be achieved through energy efficiency. In some states its well beyond that based on ACEEE estimates. The lowest cost source of energy efficiency is capital investment. For example, when a consumer is making a decision regarding a natural gas vs. electric dryer the considerations will be am I going to purchase the most efficient which will cost more, or am I going to purchase the one with the least initial cost. Purchase decisions may be made in 2016, but a gas dryer might be there for 15 years. It's important to think of this now and today. If we are serious about reducing carbon emissions we need to make sure people are making wise decisions. This is even more important when you start talking about furnaces that have a 30-year useful life. If we are serious about targets for carbons in 2040 or 2050 we have to be making the right decisions today. That's the burning platform in terms of why it makes sense to push hard on this today. Does this get into the question as to whether there is a

second section about education? Pam stated, education is embedded in this kind of discussion, but do you possibly foresee structurally as separate kind of element of our recommendations. Education is an important part of everything task force does. Brian commented he refers to this as a personal energy plan. For example, your hot water heater is working and will continue for another five years. However you should know what you are going to replace it with when it does break to ensure a consumer doesn't choose the same solution and is ultimately stuck with the same technology. That could be a separate section in the final report. Brian also noted the CSEC is doing an energy fair in February and they are trying to educate the public. When we get to that topic of education CSEC should be looked at. John has been working on the Power Point as time allows, and ideally he would have liked time to speak with Jan Aceti to ensure accuracy in capturing all that CMLP does. CMLP energy efficiencies programs have a role for Energy NE in terms of development of these programs. They are the coordinator for the energy audit and in addition as part of the audit they come to your home and look at a range of areas. A discussion ensued with regard to energy audits, and the fact that two auditing sources are needed: one for natural gas; one for electric, to identify areas of energy concerns. This creates an inefficient process for the consumer. EFTF may want to weigh in on this topic. Questions raised included whether the topic of multiple audits will be covered at a public meeting and whether or not other communities have ways to offer free audits to cover multiple areas of energy concerns. The importance of differentiating between electricity rates and total electricity bill was noted. Cost vs. benefit must be considered. Longer term analysis on bills would be required to understand when savings are realized. Municipalities have the opportunity to participate in Mass Save. Jan could provide input regarding Mass Save vs. other programs and the benefit to Concord to assist in analyzing town needs. The task of how the information will be presented to the public will be discussed with Dan. Specific recommendations will not be made by EFTF; rather major issues will be unpacked in the final report. Stakeholder work should be completed and considered as it is early in the EFTF process to make proclamation regarding issues. The importance of EFTF stance as well as thoughtful framing of conversations was stressed. Wording is important. Tactics should be well defined when recommending rates. There will be much meaning in modifiers used to describe needs to allow next task force to set real direction. This presentation could be refined for presentation at a public meeting. It was noted that this document serves as a tool to identify issues and seek feedback from other EFTF members for both CMLP and issues unrelated to CMLP.

Pam asked, with regard to the final report, are "energy efficiency programs" a candidate for being in the glossary? At the end of this template, there could be proposed terms that might be in the glossary. EFTF members could identify glossary terms as well.

#### **-Stakeholders up-date (Wally Johnston)**

One interview has taken place with the Chamber of Commerce. Wally has talked with Brad and will schedule a meeting with CSEC in September. Pam Hill will coordinate with Chris Whelan and his people about meeting with him. Elise and Pam will schedule an interview with John Flaherty in early September. The question arose of how will a questionnaire and survey be accomplished? EFTF should be thinking about a survey and will go thru the stakeholder questions to see if any apply to a broader audience. Wally suggested October 17 is the right time to distribute the survey. Survey should be 12 questions maximum. Wally owes committee a spreadsheet of stakeholders. Wally will highlight any potential second interviews and requested suggestions for whom to include in a second round of interviews. John is concerned that natural self-selection of people participating in the survey will have a "green" orientation. EFTF may

wish to add questions to assess the diversity of input being collected. How would you characterize yourself? What organizations do you belong to? EFTF will want information of who is responding: residence, business, principal, category, Wally was tasked with sketching out survey questions for next meeting and a rough cut of what survey instrument might look like. When survey is ready how will it be promoted?

**6. Subject for discussion: energy efficiency delivery (John Dalton):** John Dalton and Pam Hill created a meeting roadmap. Brian Foulds will prepare SREC'S draft with comments from Dan and John. Concept of how Concord will decrease greenhouse gasses is a crucial question. Currently there is no consensus among scientists regarding methane and natural gas emissions. What's going on now; what's going on in the future? Pointing out these issues is important if we are going to make a change in how we are going to incent our community to do different things. We don't want to look naïve because issues are very complex. Scientific data we rely on is in itself problematic. EFTF must be sensitive to these areas and imbed a sense of humility. Areas of deep debate must be acknowledged. EFTF must be careful and wise. The uncertainty of science must be honored along with honoring the certainty that it is an issue globally and locally.

**7. Subjects/schedule for upcoming meetings:** Public comments to conclude at beginning of next meeting as a result of time constraints. 15 minutes or so will be dedicated to whether there should be a second round of in person interviews and what the survey instrument should look like. Survey Monkey has been suggested as a tool.

**8. Public Comments:** With regard to energy emissions the committee is urged to take a muscular approach. Only saying these are issues and not doing anything about them will result in loss of credibility. Understanding Muni vs. IOU is important. Look at stakeholder standards. Issues regarding municipalities are different. Look at SMUD, Austin, FX Collins, look at Smart Future plans. Feature those that have best practices in place. **Fran:** Carbon price should be considered by light plant. Carbon price is also known as shadow price or social cost of carbon. Decisions could include a carbon price. Any comments should be sent to John Dalton and Pam Hill.

The EFTF email address may be used to submit comments to all committee members.